

Application No.: 10/777,599

Docket No.: JCLA12098

In the Drawings

Please substitute the attached clean drawings of FIG. 1-4 with the pending drawings of FIG. 1-4. The amended portion is the addition of the reference sign "GNDA".

Application No.: 10/777,599

Docket No.: JCLA12098

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The drawings are objected under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). The specification and Claims 14-18 are objected to because of some informalities. The Office Action rejected all presently-pending Claims 1-18. Specifically, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action also rejected Claims 1-3, 7-8 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Hirasawa (US Patent No 3,976,984, hereinafter "Hirasawa"). Applicants have amended a drawing and the specification to overcome the objection and have amended claims to improve clarity. After entry of the foregoing amendments, Claims 4-5, 7-8, 11-12 and 14-18 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Response To Objections To Drawings

According to the OFFICE ACTION, The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because the drawings do not include the required reference sign(s) mentioned in the specification: GNDA, and are also objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because some reference characters are not mentioned in the description: VA', 131 and VOUT1 of Fig. 1. In response thereto, applicants have added the reference sign GNDA (i.e. the

Page 10 of 15

Application No.: 10/777,599

Docket No.: JCLA12098

ground) in Fig. 1-4 and amend paragraphs [035] for corresponding with the meaning of Fig. 1. It is believed that every reference character shown in Fig. 1-4 is properly mentioned in the specification and no new matter is entered.

Response To Objections To Specification

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because of some informalities. Applicant has amended paragraphs [0035], [0038], [0041], [0044], [0045] as suggested by the Examiner. In view of the aforementioned amendments, Applicant respectfully asserts that the objections are no longer proper.

Response To Objections To Claims

The Examiner objected to Claims 14-18 because of some informalities. Applicant has amended Claims 14-18 as required. In view of the aforementioned amendments, Applicant respectfully asserts that the objections are no longer proper.

Response To Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph.

Application No.: 10/777,599

Docket No.: JCLA12098

Regarding Claim 1, Applicants have canceled Claim 1 and incorporated the limitations thereof into Claim 4. Claim 4 is amended to further include a first control signal (VA') and a second control signal (VA) to replace with a control signal.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 13 are canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicant takes this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate any of the canceled subject matter to the public.

Claim 5 is dependent on currently amended Claim 4 and remains the same.

Claims 7 and 8 are revised to be dependent on new Claim 4.

Regarding "parasitic capacitor" of Claims 8 and 15, as disclosed in paragraph [0043], the PMOS transistor 305 is provided as a junction capacitor (i.e., a parasitic capacitor) for maintaining the analog high voltage high level VDDA, etc. This paragraph better explains the technical merits of Claims 8 and 15. However, to improve the clarity of claims 8 and 15, the language thereof are amended to be "...the capacitor comprises a transistor provided as a parasitic capacitor."

Claim 10 is canceled as mentioned above, and Claim 17 is amended to be properly dependent on Claim 16 to solve the confusion.

Claims 11, 12 are revised to be dependent on new Claim 4.

Claim 13 is canceled as mentioned above.

Page 12 of 15

Application No.: 10/777,599

Docket No.: JCLA12098

Claim 14 is amended to correct some wording errors to solve the confusion.

Claims 15-18 are amended as required and dependent on new Claim 14 to overcome the rejection.

The Applicants wish to clarify that the foregoing amendments have been made for purposes of more clearly and/or better defining the invention in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, and not in response to the rejections made based on prior art. Indeed, Applicants submit that no substantive limitations have been added to the claims. Therefore, no prosecution history estoppel arises from this/these amendment/amendments. Black & Decker, Inc. v. Hoover Service Center, 886 F.2d 1285, 1294 n. 13 (Fed. Cir. 1989); Andrew Corp. v. Gabriel Electronics, Inc., 847 F.2d 819 (Fed. Cir. 1988); Hi-Life Products Inc. v. American National Water-Mattress Corp., 842 F.2d 323, 325 (Fed. Cir. 1988); Mannesmann Demag Corp. v. Engineered Metal Products Co., Inc., 793 F.2d 1279, 1284-1285 (Fed. Cir. 1986); Moeller v. Ionetics, Inc., 794 F.2d 653 (Fed. Cir. 1986). It is believed that the foregoing amendments add no new matter to the present application. Applicants believe that these amendments place the claims in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Response To Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102(b)

Application No.: 10/777,599

Docket No.: JCLA12098

The outstanding Office Action rejected Claims 1-3, 7-8, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Hirasawa.

In response thereto, Applicants have canceled Claims 1-3 as presented above. However, pending Claims 7-8 and Claims 11-12 are amended to be dependent on Claim 4, which is distinguished over Hirasawa as set forth in the Office Action as an allowable subject matter. Therefore, its dependent Claims 7-8 and 11-12 are allowable as a matter of law, for at least the reason that the dependent Claims 7-8 and 11-12 contain all features/elements/steps of its respective independent Claim 4. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Response To Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants have amended Claims 4-5 and 14-18 to satisfactorily overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office Action. Applicants believe that these amendments place the pending claims in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Response to Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

Application No.: 10/777,599

Docket No.: JCLA12098

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated. It is believed that all the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Date: *Sept. 28, 2005*

Respectfully submitted

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee
Registration No.: 46,863

J. C. Patents
4, Venture Suite 250
Irvine, CA. 92618
Tel: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949) 660-0809
E-mail: jcpi@email.msn.com